

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY
(ADDENDUM)

International file no. PCT/EP2005/050146

Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE 101 55 514 A1 (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH) August 21, 2003
D2: DE 100 29 198 A1 (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH) December 20,
2001

Novelty:

- 1 D1 discloses a method and a system for storing, in a navigation system, map data that represent traffic path segments, only map data within a corridor around a driving route being deposited in a memory of the navigation system (see D1, sec. [0002], [0016]). The corridor is mentioned (col. 4, line 56), and it is further explained that "if applicable, driver preferences can also be taken into account, e.g. only secondary roads or only expressways" (col. 4, lines 66, 67). The "also" is understood here to mean an additional condition, i.e. a further selection of the map data also takes place in the corridor. The subject matter of Claims 1 and 7 is therefore not novel.

Inventive Step:

- 2.1 If, on the other hand, D1 is to be understood to mean that the accounting for driver preferences represents an alternative to the corridor, then the subject matter of

Claims 1 and 7 would not be inventive, since it is obvious to one skilled in the art to combine all those actions that, presupposing a limited memory capacity, permit navigation in an expanded area even without reinsertion of the data medium (see sec. [0002]).

- 2.2 Claim 5 differs from D1 in that the starting location and destination are exempted in the context of map selection. In D1, the corridor in the vicinity of the starting point and destination is narrow (D1, col. 4, lines 55-59). The object with respect to D1 is therefore to ensure that navigation in these regions is improved, since the starting location and destination are usually located in urban areas, where in some circumstances the data of a narrow corridor are not sufficient for navigation.
- 2.3 This problem is mentioned in D2 (see sec. [0020]), as is the solution, namely that these regions are generated as complete map segments, i.e. no limitation of data volume, therefore also no selection. D2 deals with fundamentally the same topic as D1, and the combination of the two documents is therefore entirely obvious to one skilled in the art. The subject matter of this claim is consequently not based on an inventive step.
- 3.1 The selection of map data in accordance with utilization probability, as in Claims 2-4, and the further uniform selection with each map-data tile, as in Claim 6, are not disclosed in documents D1 or D2, and are therefore also not rendered obvious by a combination of those documents. The subject matter of these claims is therefore novel and inventive. (It is assumed here that Claim 6 is dependent on Claims 2-4, since otherwise lack of unity would exist.)